

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

09/996,435

Examiner

Raymond J. Bayerl

Applicant(s)

SANDERSON, RICHARD A.

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to application as filed, 29 November 2001.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1 - 10.
3. ☒ The drawings filed on 29 November 2001 are accepted by the Examiner.
4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * Certified copies not received: _____.
5. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - (a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
6. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. **THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

7. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
8. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No. _____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the proposed drawing correction filed _____, which has been approved by the Examiner.
 - (c) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No. _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet.

9. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No. _____ |
| 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449), Paper No. <u>1</u> . | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment |
| 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material | 8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance |
| | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173

9 Aug-2004

ATTACHMENT TO NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY

1. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The Examiner has carefully considered applicant's seven independent claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, which are directed to the generation of a "declarative user-interface (UI)", and deems that they define patentably over the prior art now made of record. Specifically, the prior art of record does not fairly teach or suggest that the joint receipt of a "workflow description" and "meta-information" or "content specifications" be handled, as by "parsing", in developing a "UI" that properly associates the information needed for the "UI" with the "workflow" that handles it.

The best prior art example made of record is Beauchamp et al. (US #6,621,505 B1), in which PROCESS-BASED ENTERPRISE COMPUTING is accomplished with standardized interface screens (Abstract). In Beauchamp et al., moreover, [m]etadatas may provide data to a screen rendering process running on a user's workstation with details on how to render one of a plurality of standard screens in a manner which is specific to a particular process.

But while Beauchamp et al. might incorporate "workflow" descriptions into the design of the processes that may be called, this is at best an implicit designation that is the result of designer input, and not a consideration at a later run-time of a "workflow" designation relative to the needed data resources (e.g., the "content" or "meta-data"). Applicant's development heuristics are at a decidedly higher level of overall application implementation, for the individual "content" user.

Art Unit: 2173

Parsing of "workflow"-related information **does** take place in Fults et al. (US #5,327,529), and also in Notess et al. (US #5,438,659), with subsequent conversion of higher-level indications (the Fults et al. hints or the Notess et al. application developer objectives) into final "UI" objects. However, neither Fults et al. nor Notess et al. use applicant's technique of a joint consideration of "workflow" and "meta-data" or "content" specifications. Rather, these disclosures are of working at a lower level within the interface design, by the time any "parsing" takes place, and so close as to the final interactive objects that there is no fair teaching or suggestion of the claimed invention.

2. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond J. Bayerl whose telephone number is (703) 305-9789. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F from 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

4. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by FAX **must be directed** to the central FAX number (703) 872-9306.

5. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ART UNIT 2173

9 August 2004